

## REMARKS

Prior to this amendment, Claims 1-83 are pending in this application, with Claims 18-29, 40-52 and 63-81 and 83 having been withdrawn. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims as follows. Claims 30, 36, 39, 53 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,280,430 (Woods). Claims 31, 32, 38, 54, 55, 60 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,219,638 (Padmanabhan). Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,850,609 (Schrage). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods in view of Schrage and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,227 (Lyberg). Claims 8, 9, 15, 16 and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods in view of Schrage and further in view of Padmanabhan.

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has objected to Claims 12-14, 33-35, 37, 56, 57, 58 and 59 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

New Claims 84-86 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

Please cancel Claims 8, 18-29, 33, 40-52, 63-81 and 83, without prejudice.

Claims 1, 12, 30 and 53 have been amended.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claims 30 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the Examiner states that Woods teaches each and every element of Claims 30 and 53. Woods teaches a system for providing a textual record of spoken words, the textual record having reference markings selectively provided by a plurality of system users. To further clarify the invention as claimed, Claims 30 and 53 have been amended to include the recitations of

Claims 33 and 54, respectively. Claim 30, as amended, includes all the recitations of objected-to Claim 33. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of Claim 30 be withdrawn. Claim 53 as amended includes the recitation “the code that translates that transcribed text into a format compatible with the at least one printing means comprises code that integrates video, images, or graphics into transcribed text output on the at least one printing means,” which is neither taught nor suggested by Woods. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of Claim 53 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner’s rejection of Claims 31, 32, 38, 54, 55, 60 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that the combination of Woods and Padmanabhan teaches all the elements of Claims 31, 32, 38, 54, 55, 60 and 61. Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of Padmanabhan and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same. Accordingly, the Examiner’s rejection of Claims 31, 32, 38, 54, 60 and 61 under §103(a) must be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner’s rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that the combination of Woods and Schrage teaches each and every element of Claim 1. Schrage teaches recording and automated transcription methods and apparatus suitable for use in a communication system such as a telephone system. To further clarify the invention as claimed, Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation “a Multimedia Integration Module (MIM) for integrating video, images, or graphs into transcribed text output on the printing means,” which is neither taught nor suggested by Woods or Schrage or the combination thereof. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Examiner’s rejection of Claims 8, 9, 15, 16 and 82, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that the combination of Woods, Schrage and Padmanabhan teaches all the elements of Claims 8, 9, 15, 16 and 82. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the Examiner’s rejection of Claims 31, 32, 38, 54,

55, 60 and 61, Padmanabhan is an invalid reference. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of Claims 8, 9, 15, 16 and 82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) must be withdrawn.

Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-7, 9-17, 31-32, 34-39, 54-62, 82 and 84-86, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-7, 9-17, 31-32, 34-39, 54-62, 82 and 84-86 is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that pending Claims 1-7, 9-17, 30-32, 34-39, 53-62, 82 and 84-86 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Musella  
Reg. No. 39,310  
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516